

**Remarks**

**A. Claims In The Case**

Claims 68, 69, 71-77, 79-96, 98-104, 106-119 are pending. Claims 68, 71-77, 79-91, 95, 98-104, and 106-118 have been amended. Claims 70, 78, 97, and 105 have been cancelled.

**B. Section 112, Second Paragraph**

The Examiner rejected claims 68-119 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, on grounds that the phrase “the reinsurance framework classes” in claim 68, line 7 and claim 95, line 6 did not have proper antecedent basis. Applicant has amended claims 68 and 95 for clarification. The Examiner further states that claim 89 depends on cancelled claim 20. Applicant has amended claim 89 to depend on claim 88. Applicant respectfully requests removal of the 35 USC §112 rejections of these claims.

**C. The Claims Are Not Obvious Over LeBlanc in View of Copeland Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

The Examiner rejected claims 68-119 as being obvious over U.S. Patent 6,694,506 to LeBlanc et al. (“Leblanc”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,946,694 to Copeland et al. (“Copeland”). Applicant respectfully disagrees with these rejections.

To reject a claim as obvious, the Examiner has the burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. *In re Warner*, 154 U.S.P.Q. 173, 177-78 (C.C.P.A. 1967). To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974); MPEP § 2143.03.

Claims 68 and 95 have been amended to describe a combination of features including “overriding at least one of the hook methods of the reinsurance business process framework to access at least one stage in an execution of one of the reinsurance business processes and to identify a support process to be executed”. Support for the amendments to the claims can be found in Applicant’s specification at least on page 30, lines 4-7; page 32, lines 1-10; page 33, lines 15-17; and original claims 2 and 11.

Regarding claim 68, the Examiner takes the position that LeBlanc discloses using hooks “as discussed in claim 68”. LeBlanc states:

Step 51, hooks are created in the connecting object of this invention which will fire events to notify interested objects, i.e., “Dips” with respect to target object attribute or property changes which the respective Dip has requested to be monitored. Similarly, step 52, hooks are created which fire events to notify interested Dips in response the target object’s own events and in step 53, hooks are created which fire events to notify interested Dips in response the target object’s changes in status of its methods. The creation of such hooks includes receiving from the context objects or dips, the various target object properties, methods and events of interest to the dips and activating appropriate object fire events to notify the dips and to set the FireEvents triggers.

(LeBlanc, column 7, line 59 to column 8, line 5)

LeBlanc discloses creating hooks in connecting objects that fire events to notify “interested” context objects (“Dips”) relative to events and changes (e.g., changes in attributes) in target objects. LeBlanc does not disclose overriding a hook method to access a stage in the execution of reinsurance business process and to identify a support process to be executed. Copeland discloses a managed object that calls methods on a mixin object before and after calling business methods on a business object. (Copeland, column 7, lines 40-42). The mixin objects perform system and infrastructure related functions such as security checks, while the business methods do not include system level or infrastructure related activities. (Copeland, column 7, lines 40-49). Copeland does not disclose overriding hook methods to access a stage in the execution of

reinsurance business process and identify a support process to be executed.

Applicant submits that, for at least the reasons stated above, the combination of the features of claim 68 and 95 are not taught or suggested by Leblanc and Copeland.

Applicant submits that many of the claims dependent on claims 68 and 95 are separately patentable. For example, amended claim 72 describes: “wherein the at least one hook method comprises a method to be executed during initialization of one or more of the application programs.” Amended claim 73 describes: “wherein the at least one hook method that is overridden comprises a method to be executed prior to execution of a data entry support process.” Amended claim 74 describes: “wherein the at least one hook method that is overridden comprises a method to be executed during execution of data entry without a user interface.” Amended claim 75 describes: “wherein the at least one hook method that is overridden comprises a method to be executed prior to execution of a database commit support process.” Amended claim 76 describes: “wherein the at least one hook method that is overridden comprises a method to be executed prior to execution of a database rollback support process.” Amended claim 77 describes: “wherein the at least one hook method that is overridden comprises a method to be executed during validation of data.”

The Office Action acknowledges that LeBlanc and Copeland “do not disclose every hook method as recited in claims 72-77.” Nevertheless, the Office Action takes the position that “the differences between the prior art and the method recited in claims 72-77 are found only in the nonfunctional descriptive material.” The Office Action quotes MPEP §2106, which refers to nonfunctional descriptive material “that cannot alter how the process steps are to be performed to achieve the utility of the invention.” Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the features described above do alter how process steps are to be performed. For example, claim 74 describes overriding a method to be executed during execution of a data entry without a user interface. Applicant respectfully submits that the features described in claims 72-77 are not limited to

nonfunctional descriptive material.

**D. Additional Remarks**

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

If any extension of time is required, Applicant hereby requests the appropriate extension of time. If any additional fees are required or if any fees have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account Number 50-1505/5053-28301/EBM.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark R. DeLuca  
Reg. No. 44,649

Patent Agent for Applicant

MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C.  
P.O. BOX 398  
AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398  
(512) 853-8800 (voice)  
(512) 853-8801 (facsimile)

Date: 4/10/06